

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 36190

STATE OF IDAHO,	)	2009 Unpublished Opinion No. 633
	)	
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)	Filed: October 13, 2009
	)	
v.	)	Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk
	)	
RICKY WALLACE,	)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
	)	OPINION AND SHALL NOT
Defendant-Appellant.	)	BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
	)	

---

Appeal from the District Court of the Sixth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Bannock County. Hon. Stephen S. Dunn, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified sentence of five years, with three years determinate, for eluding a police officer, affirmed.

Greg S. Silvey, Kuna, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Lori A. Fleming, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

---

Before LANSING, Chief Judge, GUTIERREZ, Judge  
and MELANSON, Judge

---

PER CURIAM

While on parole, Ricky Wallace was charged with felony eluding a police officer, Idaho Code § 49-1404(1) and (2)(c), with a persistent violator enhancement. Pursuant to a plea agreement, Wallace pled guilty to the eluding charge and the state agreed to dismiss the persistent violator enhancement. Wallace was sentenced to a unified term of five years, with three years determinate and the sentence was ordered to run consecutively to a sentence for which Wallace was on parole. Wallace appeals, contending that the district court abused its discretion by imposing an excessive sentence.

Where a sentence is within the statutory limits, it will not be disturbed on appeal absent an abuse of the sentencing court's discretion. *State v. Hedger*, 115 Idaho 598, 604, 768 P.2d

1331, 1337 (1989). We will not conclude on review that the sentencing court abused its discretion unless the sentence is unreasonable under the facts of the case. *State v. Brown*, 121 Idaho 385, 393, 825 P.2d 482, 490 (1992). In evaluating the reasonableness of a sentence, we consider the nature of the offense and the character of the offender, applying our well-established standards of review. See *State v. Hernandez*, 121 Idaho 114, 117-18, 822 P.2d 1011, 1014-15 (Ct. App. 1991); *State v. Lopez*, 106 Idaho 447, 449-51, 680 P.2d 869, 871-73 (Ct. App. 1984); *State v. Toohill*, 103 Idaho 565, 568, 650 P.2d 707, 710 (Ct. App. 1982). When reviewing the length of a sentence, we consider the defendant's entire sentence. *State v. Oliver*, 144 Idaho 722, 170 P.3d 387 (2007).

Applying the foregoing standards and having reviewed the record, we conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion by imposing the sentence. Accordingly, Wallace's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.